



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,739	06/23/2003	Merle T. Brumfield	7807	9015

7590 03/23/2004

Alan F. Meckstroth  
JACOX, MECKSTROTH & JENKINS  
Suite 2  
2310 Far Hills Building  
Dayton, OH 45419-1575

EXAMINER

BUTLER, DOUGLAS C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3683

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SK

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/601,739		BRUMFIELD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Douglas C. Butler		3683	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
       Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
       Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. The submitted prior art has been considered and made of record on submitted Form PTO-1449.
2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double

Art Unit: 3683

patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1-18 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over of U.S. Patent D476275S to Winkler et al. Instant claims 1-18 are directed to an obvious variation of the design patent since it would have been obvious to use the dust cover of U.S. Patent D476275S with a conventional decorative motor vehicle wheel similar al to that of submitted references to Bottieri, Jr.(4484667) or Dean(US6371569) or Yoshida(4744606).
5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over any one of the submitted principal references to Bottieri, Jr.(4484667) or Dean(US006371569) or Yoshida(4744606) in view of Swift(3433328) or Herffurth(US006173821).

Re the conventional decorative wheel feature which for the sake of argument is lacking in the secondary references, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one having ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains

Art Unit: 3683

to modify each of the principal references to include a caliper brake cover similar to that of each of the secondary references to Swift(3433328) or Herffurth(US006173821) with the covers fastened using any type of fastener desired. Note cover 108 and 40 of Swift(3433328) and Herffurth(US006173821), respectively. Re the shape of the cover, the shape of the cover would have been an obvious matter of design choice ~~to~~ to adapt the cover to a particular type of brake caliper. A change in size and/or shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art absent the instant specification establishing criticality of the feature. Also, see MPEP 2144.04 under the heading "Legal Precedent as Source of Supporting Rationale" re various changes in size and shape.

7. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winkler et al (D476275S) in view of Swift (3433328) or Herffurth (US006173821).

**The inventorship of Winkler et al (D476275S) is not identical to the inventorship of the instant invention.**

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one having ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains to modify ~~each~~ of the principal reference Winkler et al to be used with a caliper brake cover similar to that of each of the secondary references to Swift(3433328) or Herffurth(US006173821) with the covers fastened using any type of fastener desired. Note cover 108 and 40 of Swift(3433328) and Herffurth(US006173821), respectively. Re the shape of the cover, the shape of the cover would have been an obvious matter of design choice to adapt the cover to a particular type of brake caliper. A change in size and/or shape is

Art Unit: 3683


generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art absent the instant specification establishing criticality of the feature. Also, see MPEP 2144.04 under the heading "Legal Precedent as Source of Supporting Rationale" re various changes in size and shape.

8. Note Swift(3330385) with caliper cover 20 in Figure 3.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas C. Butler whose telephone number is 703-308-2575. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 5:30 am to 2pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Lavinder can be reached on 703-308-3421. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Douglas C. Butler  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3683  
3/17/04

\*\*\*